

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,380	03/30/2004	Paul James Buriak	2004B020	4679
ExxonMobil C	7590 03/09/200 hemical Company	EXAMINER		
Law Technology			AUGHENBAUGH, WALTER	
P.O. Box 2149 Baytown, TX 7			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, ,			1772	
				- <u></u>
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 [DAYS	03/09/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		A					
,		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summan.		10/813,380	BURIAK ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Walter B. Aughenbaugh	1772				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence addr	ess			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period tre to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply but will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS tute, cause the application to become ABAND	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this com ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•			
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a)□	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	is action is non-final.		•			
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-63 is/are pending in the application	on.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)	Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-63</u> are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers			•			
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			•			
	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri		eived in this National St	age			
* 0	application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	a.t				
	see the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not rece	eivea.				
Attachmen	• •	<u> </u>					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		ial Patent Application				
	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/813,380

Art Unit: 1772

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. During a telephone conversation with Shawn Foster on November 20, 2006, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of the Group of claims that Examiner had identified as Group I, claims 1-44.
- 2. Due to Examiner's reconsideration of the groupings proposed in the restriction requirement made on November 20, 2006, a new restriction requirement is made of record below.
- 3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-55, drawn to a pipe (recited in independent claims 1, 15 and 32) and well tubing joint (recited in independent claim 45), classified in class 428, subclass 36.9.
 - II. Claims 56-63, drawn to a process for the manufacture of a multilayer pipe, classified in class 264, subclass 514.
- 4. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as injection molding.
- 5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the

Art Unit: 1772

inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

- 6. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: the pipe recited in independent claims 1 and 15 that requires three components and the pipe (recited in independent claim 32)/well tubing joint (recited in independent claim 45) that requires four components, including a reinforcing structure (claim 32)/rigid tubular section (claim 45) that is not recited in claims 1-31. The species are independent or distinct because the identified species are not connected in any of design, operation, or effect under the disclosure.
- 7. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is generic.
- 8. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

9. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Art Unit: 1772

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

10. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim

Application/Control Number: 10/813,380

Art Unit: 1772

Page 5

will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

11. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter B. Aughenbaugh whose telephone number is (571) 272-1488. While the examiner sets his work schedule under the Increased Flexitime Policy, he can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:45am to 5:15pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/813,380

Art Unit: 1772

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Walter B. Aughenbaugh Watter B. Augh laugh 3/04/07

03/04/07